



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/586,641	06/05/2000	HIROKATSU SHIMADA	15162/02070	7764

24367 7590 03/28/2005

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 NORTH HARWOOD
SUITE 3400
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/586,641

Applicant(s)

SHIMADA, HIROKATSU

Examiner

Thierry L Pham

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: RCE filed on 01/26/05.
- Claims 1-20 are pending in application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/26/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. First embodiment (pages 10-12) involves converting the unfinished print data from L*a*b* to YCMK prior to be printed by substitute printer. Second embodiment (pages 12-14) involves converting the unfinished print data from RGB to YMCK prior to be printed by substitute printer. By doing so, quality of the images printed by the selected substitute printer is the "same" as that of the images printed by the printer in which the problem is detected. By converting print data to YCMK from RGB or L*a*b* does not guarantee the quality of the images printed by the selected substitute printer is the "same" as that of the images printed by the printer in which the problem is detected. For example, an original selected printer is a laser printer with higher resolution, and a substitute selected printer is an inkjet printer; apparently, the images quality printed by these two printers are not the same, regardless of how the print data is modified and/or corrected. First, ink quality/density/resolution of these two printers are different;

Art Unit: 2624

secondly, characteristics/capabilities of these two printers are different, and finally, original selected printer is a laser printer, and a substitute printer is an inkjet printer. Therefore, it would be impossible to obtain the same image qualities by using a substitute printer, unless the substitute printer having the same model/capabilities/ink/density/resolution and etc. The examiner recommends the applicants to consider replacing the term "same quality" to a different term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18, 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub et al (U.S. 6552813), and in view of Ito et al (U.S. 5982983).

Regarding claim 1, Yacoub discloses a printer control device (server, Fig. 3 & 4) which controls multiple printers (Fig. 4) connected to a network circuit, said printer control device comprising:

- a detector (a detecting means is incorporated within a server, col. 4, lines 28-52) for detecting a problem in any of the printers;
- a selection controller (server, Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-12) for selecting, when a problem is detected by the detector, another normally functioning printer to substitute (substitute printer, abstract and col. 4, lines 28-67) for the printer in which the problem is detected by said detector; and
- a substitute controller for selecting the substitute printer for the failed selected printer to ensure same quality (finding substitute printer for failed printer, col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-12).

However, Yacoub fails to explicitly teach and/or suggest a substitution controller for correcting print data, that was to have been printed out by the printer in which the problem is detected by said detector, based on a color information of the printer in which the problem is

Art Unit: 2624

detected by the detector and a color information of the selected substitute printer, and for outputting the corrected print data to the selected substitute printer.

Ito, in the same field of printing system, teaches a substitution controller (i.e. controller A, fig. 1) for correcting print data (controller A for correcting the print data based upon the characteristics of the output device (i.e. printer B of fig. 1), col. 2, lines 5-63 and col. 4, lines 18-40, and col. 7, lines 60-67), that was to have been printed out by the printer in which the problem is detected by said detector, based on a color information of the printer in which the problem is detected by the detector and a color information of the selected substitute printer (characteristics of output device including color information, col. 2, lines 5-63 and col. 4, lines 18-40, and col. 7, lines 60-67), and for outputting the corrected print data to the selected substitute printer (i.e. printer B, fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Yacoub as per teachings of Ito to include a substitute controller for correcting print data based upon an output device's characteristics because of a following reason: (●) to ensure high quality visible images (Ito, col. 1, lines 15-20); (●) maintain constant high quality regardless of the differences among the various kinds of printer (Ito, col. 2, lines 45-50 and col. 8, lines 1-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yacoub with Ito to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Ito further discloses a printer control device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the print data include color print data that indicate a color image (color, col. 2, lines 5-65), and said substitution controller performs correction (data (controller A for correcting the print data based upon the characteristics of the output device (i.e. printer B of fig. 1), col. 2, lines 5-63 and col. 4, lines 18-40, and col. 7, lines 60-67), so that a color characteristic of the color image printed by the printer in which the problem is detected are the same as that of the color image printed by the selected substitute printer.

Regarding claim 3, Ito further discloses a printer control device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the print data include middletone print data that indicate a middletone image, and the

Art Unit: 2624

substitution controller performs correction so that a gradation characteristic (gradation characteristics, col. 2, lines 25-28) of the midtone image printed by the printer in which the problem is detected are the same as the gradation characteristic of the midtone image printed by the selected substitute printer.

Regarding claim 5, Yacoub further discloses a printer control device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said multiple printers include a copying machine (fig. 2), and multifunction printer includes a copying function is known in the art and widely available.

Regarding claims 6-8, 10: Claims 6-8, 10 are the methods corresponding the apparatus and recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1-3, 5 therefore, claims 6-8, 10 are rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-3, 5 above.

Regarding claims 11-13, 15: Claims 11-13, 15 recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1-3, 5 except computer readable memory for storing computer programs. All computers/printers have some type of computer readable medium (i.e. ROM, Ito, fig. 1) for storing computer programs, hence claims 11-13, 15 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claims 1-3, 5.

Regarding claims 16-18, 20: Claims 16-18, 20 recite limitations (i.e. system) that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1-3, 5 therefore, claims 16-18, 20 are rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-3, 5 above. A system includes a host computer and a printer is shown in fig. 1 of Ito.

Claims 4, 9, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Hirofumi et al (JP 410301737A).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 4, the combinations of Yacoub and Ito do not disclose explicitly wherein said substitution controller outputs to the selected substitute printer the print data for remaining pages not printed by the printer in which the problem is detected.

Hirofumi, in the same field of endeavor for detecting failure printers in the network, discloses substitution controller outputs to the selected substitute printer the print data for remaining pages (abstract and computer-translation, p.3, paragraph 14) not printed by the printer in which the problem is detected.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Yacoub and Ito as per teachings of Hirofumi (print remaining pages) because of a following reason: to increase printing capability and to eliminate the waiting time when errors occurred within the networked printers (Yacoub, col. 3, lines 23-47 and col. 10, lines 50-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hirofumi with Yacoub to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Regarding claim 9: Claim 9 is the methods corresponding the apparatus and recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claim 4; therefore, claim 9 rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claim 4 above.

Regarding claim 14: Claim 14 recites limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claim 4 except computer readable memory for storing computer programs. All computers/printers have some type of computer readable medium (i.e. ROM, Ito, fig. 1) for storing computer programs, hence claim 14 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claim 4.

Regarding claim 19: Claim 19 recites limitations (i.e. system) that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claim 4 therefore, claim 19 is rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claim 4 above. A system includes a host computer and a printer is shown in fig. 1 of Ito.

Art Unit: 2624

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Closely consideration of these prior art references is recommended.


- U.S. 5835243 to Mori, teaches an apparatus/method for correcting print data including color conversion based upon characteristics (i.e. color information) of the output device (printers).
- U.S. 6404509 to Kuwata et al, teaches an apparatus/method for correcting print data including color conversion based upon characteristics (i.e. color information) of the output device (printers).
- U.S. 6473197 to Shimazaki, teaches an apparatus/method for correcting print data including color conversion based upon characteristics (i.e. color information) of the output device (printers).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L Pham whose telephone number is (703) 305-1897. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on (703)308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thierry L. Pham



GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER